

[3rd February 1925]

(b) whether, under the said Government Order, all out-patients whose incomes are not below Rs. 30 a month are required to pay two annas for medicines on each occasion they attend the hospital including each of the occasions on which the patient attends for repeating the medicine;

(c) whether the two annas is merely the admission fee or cost of medicine; and

(d) whether, in view of the fact that the cost of living has increased, it is contemplated to reconsider the matter and issue a revised circular?

A.—(a) & (b) The answer is in the affirmative.

(c) The amount collected represents payment for medicines supplied.

Medical advice is free to all out-patients.

(d) The question is under the consideration of the Government.

Education.

Law College Reorganization Committee's report.

*22 Q.—Mr. S. SATYAMURTI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) the reasons why the Government passed orders on the Law College Reorganization Committee's report without reference to the Board of Studies in Law, the Faculty of Law, the Syndicate, the Academic Council, or the Senate, or the High Court, or the Vakils' Association;

(b) the reasons why this new system is to be brought into force in the middle of an academic year;

(c) whether the Government accept the recommendation of the Committee with regard to the tenure and continuance of the Assistant Lecturers and if not, why not;

(d) the reasons why juniors of more than six years' standing at the Bar are excluded from the field of selection for the assistant lecturerships;

(e) the appointing authority in regard to all these appointments; and

(f) the exact powers of the College Council over the affairs of the college?

A.—(a) The hon. Member's attention is invited to the answer to clause (f) of question No. 1452, asked at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 6th December 1924.

(b) The Government consider that it would be in the interests of the college to give effect to the revised arrangements as early as practicable.

(c) It is not clear what the specific recommendations are which are referred to. Assistant Lecturers will be appointed for three years and the question of the renewal of the term in each case will be considered on the merits.

(d) The policy is to appoint as Assistant Lecturers junior practitioners who can give sufficient time and attention to the work of the college.

(e) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to the supplementary question asked by him at the last meeting of the Council.

(f) The hon. Member's attention is invited to paragraph 7 of G.O. No. 1702, Law (Education), dated 5th November 1924.

3rd February 1925]

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“With reference to the answer to clause (c), may I ask whether the Government accepted the recommendations made by the Committee and by the College Council in regard to the names recommended for appointment as Assistant Lecturers ?”

The hon. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO :—“Names are to be recommended. The appointment is with the Local Government.”

Industries.

The Indian Tariff Board's omission to visit Madras.

*23 Q.—**Mr. S. SATYAMURTI**: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Indian Tariff Board was advised by the Madras Government not to visit Madras ;

(b) the reasons for that advice ; and

(c) whether before giving that advice the Government took any non-official opinion, and, if so, what that opinion was ?

A.—(a) The Government suggested to the Board that it was scarcely worth while for it to visit Madras in connexion with its investigations into the printer's ink, paper, cement and magnesium chloride industries.

(b) Because there is no manufacture of printer's ink in this Presidency while in regard to the other industries the Government thought that the two or three witnesses who offered to give oral evidence could, in the interests of economy, preferably be invited to Poona which the Board proposed to visit.

(c) No.

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“With reference to the answer to clause (c), may I know why no non-official opinion was consulted in the matter, before Government told the Tariff Board not to visit Madras ?”

The hon Diwan Bahadur T. N. SIVAGNANAM PILLAI :—“The Government did not consider it necessary.”

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS.

Civil Justice.

Memorial from the second-grade pleaders of the Presidency.

24 Q.—**Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR**: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) the year when the second-grade pleadership examination was abolished ;

(b) the number of second-grade pleaders now practising in the Presidency ;

(c) whether any memorial was received at any time from the second-grade pleaders of the Presidency, that they should be placed on the same footing as first-grade pleaders, whether it was referred to various District Judges and Bar Associations in the Presidency and, if so, with what result and how the memorial was finally disposed of ; and

(d) whether the Government will place on the table copies of the correspondence on the subject ?